



determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s thorough analysis. Stated plainly, it appears that Plaintiff’s claim for damages would imply the invalidity of his conviction and is barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). Additionally, even if not barred by *Heck*, Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a claim for relief because Plaintiff provides no facts to support his claim that Defendant violated his federal constitutional or statutory rights.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **adopts and incorporates** the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 8), and the Court **dismisses this action without prejudice, without leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

February 8, 2023  
Charleston, South Carolina